

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

In re application of YEN LU Serial No.: 10/668,399 Filed: 09/23/2003 Title: METHOD FOR SELECTIVELY RELOADING FRAMES OF A WEB PAGE Atty Docket Number: CA920020042US1	: Before the Examiner: JOSHUA D CAMPBELL  : Group Art Unit: 2178  : Amy J. Pattillo : P.O. Box 161327 : Austin, Tx 78716 : 512-402-9820
--	---

**APPEAL BRIEF UNDER 37 CFR §41.37**

Mail Stop Appeal Briefs - Patents  
Commissioner of Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

This Appeal Brief is submitted in support of the Appeal in the above-referenced application pursuant to a Notice of Appeal filed January 2, 2008 as required by 37 C.F.R. 41.31. This is an appeal from a final rejection dated October 1, 2007 of Claims 1-15 and 20-26 of application serial number 10/668,399, filed 9/23/2003.

**I. Real Party in Interest**

The real party in interest in the present application is the Assignee, International Business Machines Corporation of Armonk, New York, as evidenced by the Assignment set forth at Reel 014554 and frame 0344.

## **II. Related Appeals and Interferences**

There are no Appeals or Interferences known to Appellant, Appellant's legal representative, or assignee which may be related to, directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal. No decisions have been rendered by a court or the Board in any related applications.

### **III. Status of Claims**

1. Status of All Claims in Application
  - a. Claims Rejected: 1-15 and 20-26.
  - b. Claims Allowed or Confirmed: None.
  - c. Claims Withdrawn from Consideration: None.
  - d. Claims Objected to: None.
  - e. Claims Cancelled: 16-19.
2. Claims on Appeal
  - a. The claims being appealed are: 1-15 and 20-26.
  - b. The claims being appealed stand finally rejected as noted by the Examiner in the Examiner's Action dated October 1, 2007. These rejected claims, which form the basis of this appeal, are reproduced in the attached Appendix.

#### **IV. Status of Amendments**

The Examiner finally rejected claims 1-15 and 20-26 in a final office action dated October 1, 2007.

In particular, the final office action dated October 1, 2007, the Examiner rejected claims 1-15 and 20-26 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin et al (US Publication 2003/0036975) in view of Bautista-Lloyd (US Publication 2002/0152239). [Final Office Action, p. 3] No amendments to claims 1-15 and 20-26, which are on appeal, were made following the final office action dated October 1, 2007.

## **V. Summary of Claimed Subject Matter**

Claim 1 is directed to a method for creating a web page adapted to automatically reload selected frames of the web page in response to a trigger event. (Specification, page 1, paragraph 0011, lines 1-3). A first frameset is defined within the web page comprising a target frame to serve as a work area for performing programmed logic separate from multiple frames of the web page defined in a main frameset. (Specification, page 1, paragraph 0011, lines 3-5; page 3, paragraph 0032, lines 1-18, paragraph 0034, lines 1-6). The action is associated with a trigger event with the action having the target frame as a target. (Specification, page 1, paragraph 0011, lines 5-6; page 3, paragraph 0032, lines 15-18). The programmed location is associated with the action with the programmed logic being adapted to specify the selected frames not including at least one frame to avoid reloading from among the multiple frames of the main frameset and to reload only the selected frames within the web page regardless of the membership of the selected frames in additional framesets used to create the web page. (Specification, page 1, paragraph 0011, lines 6-10; page 3, paragraph 0037, lines 1-6).

Claim 2 is directed to the method of claim 1 wherein the web page is a dynamic web page requiring adapting a content of the selected frames of the web page before reloading and re-rendering the selected frames. (Specification, page 3, paragraph 0031, lines 12-16).

Claim 3 is directed to the method of claim 1 and is further directed to passing the action to the trigger area responsive to the trigger event occurring, (Specification, page 4, paragraph 0041, lines 1-4), executing the programmed logic associated with the action in the work area to collect required data and send a request to a web server with the required data for a script to control reloading, (Specification, page 4, paragraph 0041, lines 4-10) and responsive to receiving a response in the work area with a script and rendering data from the web server, executing the script received from the web server to reload the selected frames as specified in the script with the rendering data. (Specification, page 4, paragraph 0041, lines 10-12)

Claim 4 is directed to the method of claim 1 wherein defining the target frame is further directed to defining a frame of 0 rows and 0 columns at an edge of the web page. (Specification, page 2, paragraph 0012, lines 4-8; page 3, paragraph 0032, lines 7-10; page 3, paragraph 0033, lines 10-13).

Claim 5 is directed to the method of claim 1 wherein defining the frame further is further directed to defining the first frameset using a first frameset tag in the web page to partition the web page into the main frameset comprising the plurality of frames, and separately the target frame having the null dimension. (Specification, page 2, paragraph 0012, lines 9-13; page 3, paragraph 0032, lines 19-25).

Claim 6 is directed to the method of claim 1 and is further directed to associating the action with programmed logic for reloading only the selected frames of the web page in dependence on a predefined set of conditions. (Specification, page 2, paragraph 0013, lines 1-4; page 3, paragraph 0032, lines 9-18).

Claim 7 is directed to the method of claim 1 and is further directed to accessing server-side functions in dependence on a predefined set of conditions, wherein the server-side functions return the programmed logic for directing client-side reloading of only the selected frames. (Specification, page 2, paragraph 0013, lines 1-7; page 3, paragraph 0031, lines 18-22; paragraph 0037, lines 1-9; page 4, paragraph 0045, lines 1-11).

Claim 8 is directed to the method of claim 7 and is further directed to associating the action with a link to a dynamic uniform resource locator, wherein the dynamic uniform resource locator directs access to the server-side functions. (Specification, page 3, paragraph 0031, lines 8-12, lines 19-22).

Claim 9 is directed to the method of claim 8 wherein providing the link is further directed to providing a dynamic server page link. (Specification, page 3, paragraph 0031, lines 8-12, lines 19-22; page 4, paragraph 0043, lines 1-8).

Claims 10, 11, 12, 13 are directed to a system including a processor and having means for managing a dynamic web page as described by the steps in claims 1, 2, 3, 4, respectively. (Specification, page 2, paragraph 0030, lines 1-9).

In addition, claim 14 is directed to the system of claim 10 wherein the trigger is further directed to one of a link and a form that has the script as an action attribute and the target frame as a target attribute. (Specification, page 2, paragraph 0016, lines 4-8).

Claim 15 is directed to the system of claim 14 wherein the action attribute is further directed to a uniform resource locator (url) of a dynamic web page that includes the script and effects the downloading of the dynamic web page to the target frame, and the script with rendering information provides a set of instructions that include instructions for reloading only the respective selected frames, regardless of respective membership of the selected frames in framesets of the web page. (Specification, page 2, paragraph 0016, lines 6-12; page 3, paragraph 0037, lines 1-9).

Claims 20, 25, and 26 are directed to a computer readable medium for storing program instructions for reloading only selected frames in at least two framesets of a web page and having instructions for performing the steps in claims 1, 2, and 3 respectively. (Specification, page 2, paragraph 0020, lines 1-8).

Claim 21 is directed to the computer readable medium of claim 20 wherein the instructions for instantiating are further directed to a file written in hypertext markup language (HTML), that comprises a plurality of frameset definitions, including a definition of the first frameset comprising the target frame. (Specification, page 2, paragraph 0021, lines 1-4; page 3, paragraph 0038, lines 1-16).

Claim 22 is directed to the computer readable medium of claim 21 wherein the file is further directed to an event handling mechanism that associates the trigger with an action that comprises the instructions for reloading. (Specification, page 2, paragraph 0021, lines 4-8; page 4, paragraph 0039, lines 1-4).

Claim 23 is directed to the computer readable medium of claim 22 wherein the action is an attribute of one of a link and a form, and the event is a corresponding one of a selection of the link, and a submission of the form.



(Specification, page 2, paragraph 0016, lines 4-6; page 3, paragraph 0037, lines 1-7).

Claim 24 is directed to the computer readable medium of claim 23 wherein the one of the link and the form has a target attribute set to the target frame.

(Specification, page 2, paragraph 0016, lines 4-6).

**VI. Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal**

1. Claims 1-15 and 20-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Martin et al. (US Publication 2003/0036975) (herein referred to as Martin) in view of Bautista-Lloyd et al. (US Publication 2002/0152239) (herein referred to as Bautista-Lloyd).

## **VII. Argument**

### **1. 35 U.S.C. 103(a), Alleged Obviousness under Martin in view of Bautista-Lloyd**

The Final Office Action rejects claims 1-15 and 20-26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Martin in view of Bautista-Lloyd. [Final Office Action, p. 3]

As noted in the Final Office Action under 35 USC §103(a) a patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed as described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. In *Graham v. John Deere*, the Supreme Court clarified that “under 103, in considering the obviousness or nonobviousness of the subject matter, the scope and content of the prior art are to be determined; differences between the prior art and the claims at issue are to be ascertained; and the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art resolved, in addition to evaluating evidence of secondary considerations.” *Graham*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966).

The Examiner bears the initial burden of supporting any prima facie conclusion of obviousness. See *In re Rinehart*, 531, F.2d 1048, 189, USPQ 143 (CCPA 1976); *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 82 USPQ2d 1385, 1396 (2007); MPEP 2142. The key to supporting a rejection under 35 USC 103 is the clear articulation of the reasons why the claimed invention would have been obvious; the analysis supporting a rejection under 35 USC 103 should be made explicit. See *KSR International Co.*, 82 USPQ2d at 1396; MPEP 2142 (Rev. 6, Sept. 2007).

Appellants traverse the rejection of the claims as not obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). In addition, Appellants respectfully assert that the claims do not all stand or fall together.

### **Claim 1**

Claim 1, as presented on appeal, reads:

1. A method for creating a web page adapted to automatically reload selected frames of the web page in response to a trigger event, the method comprising:
  - defining, within the web page, a first frameset comprising a target frame to serve as a work area for performing programmed logic separate from a plurality of frames of the web page defined in a main frameset;
  - associating an action with the trigger event, the action having the target frame as a target; and
  - associating the programmed logic with the action, the programmed logic being adapted to specify the selected frames not including at least one frame to avoid reloading from among the plurality of frames of the main frameset and to reload only the selected frames within the web page, regardless of a membership of the selected frames in additional framesets used to create the web page.

Applicants respectfully assert that the Office has erred in finding a prima facie case of obviousness as to claim 1 because under a proper Graham analysis, when Martin and Bautista-Lloyd are considered as a whole, the references, do not teach the elements of claim 1 and there is no clear statement as to the rationale for one of ordinary skill in the art finding claim 1 as a whole obvious in view of the differences between Martin and Bautista-Lloyd and claim 1.

First, in the Graham inquiry, as to the scope of the contents and field of invention of Martin, the Final Office Action cites paragraphs 0058-0063 of Martin as describing “defining a target frame within a web page adapted to serve as a work area for performing programming logic, the programming logic being associated with an action that is controlled by a trigger event and that targets the target frame” and as reading on the elements of defining, within the web page, a first frameset comprising a target frame to serve as a work area for performing programmed logic separate from a plurality of frames of the web page defined in a main frameset and associating an action with the trigger event, the action having the target frame as a target. [Final Office Action, p. 3] In addition, the

Final Office Action cites these same paragraphs 0058-0063 of Martin as describing “the logic is adapted to specify the selected frames among a plurality of frames of the web page, not including the target frame and reload only the selected frames regardless of their membership in framesets used to create the web page.” [Final Office Action, p. 3]

As to a field of invention, Martin describes an electronic auction system, where a user can change the parameters of the auction and the system refreshes the copy of the auction at a browser of an auction participant. *Martin*, abstract. As to the scope of contents of Martin, Martin describes a target frame within a browser with scripts that determine whether any changes have been made to data on a server, and if data changes have been made to the auction on the server, triggers loading all the remaining frames on the page from the server. *Martin*, paragraphs 0058-0063. Thus, Martin describes a target frame with logic for determining whether to reload all the other frames on a page.

Appellants respectfully assert that the scope of Martin does not, in fact, teach programmed logic that is further adapted to specify the selected frames to reload. In particular, Appellants respectfully assert that Martin does not teach programmed logic that specifically selects frames before reloading the frames, but merely describes that if data at a server has changed, then the remaining frames of the page are reloaded.

The Final Office Action cites Martin as reading on the elements of claim 1, except for “the at least one of the frames of the visible frameset that does not need to be refreshed is not included in the reloading process.” The Final Office Action cites Bautista-Lloyd as disclosing “selectively updating only the frames that need to be updated, thus excluding any frame in the visible frameset that does not need to be reloaded” in paragraph 0007. [Final Office Action, p. 3]

In considering the field of invention and scope and content of Bautista-Lloyd, Bautista-Lloyd describes the problem that when a web page includes dynamic content accessed from different sources, each frame includes a tag that when triggered, triggers reloading of all the dynamic content on the page, even if only some of the content has changed. *Bautista-Lloyd*, paragraphs 0004, 0005.

In particular, in considering Bautista-Lloyd as a whole, including paragraph 0007 cited in the Final Office Action, Bautista-Lloyd describes that rather than a web page triggering frame updates for each frame that includes dynamic content, a server monitors for state changes on a frame by frame basis, generates an update package with updated dynamic content on a frame by frame basis, and delivers the update package to the client for the presentation program (browser) displaying the page to use in updating a particular frame within a page. *Bautista-Lloyd*, paragraphs 0004, 0005, and 0007.

Next, in considering the differences between Martin and Bautista-Lloyd and the claimed elements of defining, within the web page, a first frameset comprising a target frame to serve as a work area for performing programmed logic separate from a plurality of frames of the web page defined in a main frameset and associating the programmed logic with the action, the programmed logic being adapted to specify the selected frames not including at least one frame to avoid reloading from among the plurality of frames of the main frameset and to reload only the selected frames within the web page, Applicants respectfully note that in considering claim 1 as a whole, programming logic triggered within a frame of the web page determines only a selection of less than the plurality of frames to reload, where the plurality of frames does not include the target frame. A clear difference between Martin and Bautista-Lloyd and claim 1 is that Martin describes a frame with logic that checks whether data has changed on a server, and if it has changed, triggers reloading all the other frames in the web page and Bautista-Lloyd describes a server delivering updates to a browser for a particular frame, but neither of these references teaches programming logic triggered within a frame of a web page which determines only a selection of the remaining frames to reload within that web page and controls reloading of only the selected remaining frames.

Therefore, in view of the scope and contents of Martin and Bautista-Lloyd and the differences between Martin and Bautista-Lloyd and claim 1, it is clear that the differences between Martin and Bautista-Lloyd and claim 1 are not such that claim 1 as a whole would have been obvious to one with skill in the art at the

time of the invention. Clearly, Martin only describes browser side logic for checking whether data on a server has changed; Martin does not teach browser side logic for specifying selected frames for reloading or for triggering a reload of only a selection of frames. Bautista-Lloyd only describes selective delivery of data. It would not be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to first modify Martin to teach browser-side logic for specifying selected frames for reloading and then to modify Martin's browser-side logic to trigger uploading of only the selected frames and then to further modify Bautista-Lloyd's selective delivery of data to yield client-side programming logic for selecting frames to reload and client-side programming logic for triggering reloading of those selected frames. Thus, regardless of the Examiner's stated rationale for obviousness, it is clear that the gap between the prior art and claim 1 is so wide as to render the claims nonobvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

As to the rationale stated in the Final Office Action for why claim 1 would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, the Final Office Action concludes that "It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Martin with the teachings of Bautista-Lloyd because it would have decreased the server load and network bandwidth by selectively updating only the frames that need to be updated." [Office Action, p. 3]

Applicants note that rejections on obviousness cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness. *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 82 USPQ2d 1385, 1396 (2007); MPEP 2141. In particular, because there is at least one difference between Martin and Bautista-Lloyd and claim 1, to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, the Office Action should include a clear articulation of a rationale for why, in view of the scope and content of Martin and Bautista-Lloyd and the differences between Martin and Bautista-Lloyd and claim 1, claim 1 would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. *KSR*, 82 USPQ2d at 1396; MPEP 2141. The conclusory statement as to obviousness stated with regard to

claim 1 does not clearly articulate why one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would have found claim 1 obvious despite the fact that Martin and Bautista-Lloyd do not teach at least one of the elements as taught in claim 1. As indicated by Applicants' comparison of the prior art as a whole with claim 1 as a whole, and the number and complexity of modifications required to reach claim 1 as a whole through the combination of the prior art, Applicants respectfully assert that a mere statement of a reason that a person of ordinary skill in the art might combine Martin and Bautista-Lloyd based on decreasing server load and network bandwidth by selectively updating only the frames that need to be updated does not reach the level of articulated reasoning within some rational underpinning required to support the legal conclusion of obviousness required under 35 USC 101 and KSR International, and further does not clearly articulate any of the rationales stated in section 2100 of the MPEP as exemplary rationales. In particular, the Final Office Action fails to state what known method would be implemented for combining Martin's client-side programming logic for triggering reloading with Bautista-Lloyd's server-side servlets for delivering data to a client to yield the client-side programming logic for selecting which frames to reload and triggering reloading of only those frames. Because there is no clear and explicit articulated reasoning with a clear rationale underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness, the Office Action fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness as to claim 1.

Therefore, because a proper Graham factual finding indicates differences between Martin and Bautista-Lloyd and claim 1 and no clear articulation of the reasons why the claimed invention of claim 1 would have been obvious is provided, the Office erred in finding prima facie obviousness as to claim 1. MPEP 2141, IV. Because the Office fails to find prima facie obviousness as to claim 1, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 USC 103(a) and allowance of the claims.

### **Claims 10 and 20**



Claims 10 and 20 are rejected under the same grounds as claim 1. [Office Action, p. 5] Applicants respectfully assert that claims 10 and 20 are not obvious under 35 USC 103(a) in view of Martin and Bautista-Lloyd for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is not obvious in view of Martin and Bautista-Lloyd. Because claims 10 and 20 are not obvious under 35 USC 103(a), Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 10 and 20 under 35 USC 103(a) and allowance of the claims.

**Claims 2-9, 11-15, and 21-26**

Applicants respectfully assert that because claims 1, 10, and 20 are nonobvious under 35 USC 103(a), claims 2-9, 11-15, and 21-26 which depend on claims 1, 10, and 20, are also nonobvious and should be allowed. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

**CONCLUSION**

It is therefore respectfully requested that the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-15 and 20-26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be reversed and the claims allowed.

Please charge the fee of \$500.00 for submission of an Appeal Brief under 37 CFR 41.20(b)(2) to IBM Corporation Deposit Account No. 09-0447. No additional filing fee is believed to be necessary; however, in the event that any additional fee is required, please charge it to IBM Corporation Deposit Account No. 09-0447.

Respectfully submitted,  
By /Amy J. Pattillo, Reg. No. 46,983/  
AMY J. PATTILLO  
Registration No. 46,983  
P.O. BOX 161327  
AUSTIN, TEXAS 78716  
ATTORNEY FOR APPELLANTS  
Telephone: 512-402-9820  
Facsimile: 512-306-0417

### **VIII. Claims Appendix**

The Claims involved in the Appeal are as follows:

1. A method for creating a web page adapted to automatically reload selected frames of the web page in response to a trigger event, the method comprising:
  - defining, within the web page, a first frameset comprising a target frame to serve as a work area for performing programmed logic separate from a plurality of frames of the web page defined in a main frameset;
  - associating an action with the trigger event, the action having the target frame as a target; and
  - associating the programmed logic with the action, the programmed logic being adapted to specify the selected frames not including at least one frame to avoid reloading from among the plurality of frames of the main frameset and to reload only the selected frames within the web page, regardless of a membership of the selected frames in additional framesets used to create the web page.
2. A method as claimed in claim 1 wherein the web page is a dynamic web page requiring adapting a content of the selected frames of the web page before reloading and re-rendering the selected frames.

3. A method as claimed in claim 1 further comprising:  
responsive to the trigger event occurring, passing the action to the trigger area;  
executing the programmed logic associated with the action in the work area to collect required data and send a request to a web server with the required data for a script to control reloading; and  
responsive to receiving a response in the work area with a script and rendering data from the web server, executing the script received from the web server to reload the selected frames as specified in the script with the rendering data.
4. A method as claimed in claim 1 wherein defining the target frame comprises defining a frame of 0 rows and 0 columns at an edge of the web page.
5. A method as claimed in claim 1 wherein defining the frame further comprises defining the first frameset using a first frameset tag in the web page to partition the web page into the main frameset comprising the plurality of frames, and separately the target frame having the null dimension.
6. A method as claimed in claim 1 further comprising associating the action with programmed logic for reloading only the selected frames of the web page in dependence on a predefined set of conditions.
7. A method as claimed in claim 1 further comprising:  
accessing server-side functions in dependence on a predefined set of conditions, wherein the server-side functions return the programmed logic for directing client-side reloading of only the selected frames.
8. A method as claimed in claim 7 further comprising associating said action with a link to a dynamic uniform resource locator, wherein said dynamic uniform resource locator directs access to said server-side functions.

9. A method as claimed in claim 8 wherein providing the link comprises providing a dynamic server page link.
10. A system including a processor for managing a dynamic web page having a plurality of frames, comprising:
- means for displaying the dynamic web page comprising a first frameset comprising a target frame to serve as a work area for performing programmed logic separate from the plurality of frames of the web page defined in a main frameset; and
  - means for triggering a script associated with the target frame and adapted to specify the selected frames not including at least one from to avoid reloading from among the plurality of frames of the main frameset and to reload only the selected frames of any frameset used to create the web page.
11. The system as claimed in claim 10 wherein the dynamic web page comprises means for adapting a content of the selected frames before reloading and re-rendering the selected frames.
12. The system as claimed in claim 10, further comprising:
- means, responsive to the trigger event occurring, for passing the action to the trigger area;
  - means for executing the programmed logic associated with the action in the work area to collect required data and send a request to a web server with the required data for a script to control reloading; and
  - means, responsive to receiving a response in the work area with a script and rendering data from the web server, for executing the script received from the web server to reload the selected frames as specified in the script with the rendering data.

13. The system as claimed in claim 10 wherein the first frameset is defined by a frameset tag that provides the main frameset and the target frame has 0 columns and 0 rows.

14. The system as claimed in claim 10 wherein the trigger comprises one of a link and a form that has the script as an action attribute and the target frame as a target attribute.

15. The system as claimed in claim 14 wherein the action attribute comprises a uniform resource locator (url) of a dynamic web page that includes the script and effects the downloading of the dynamic web page to the target frame, and the script with rendering information provides a set of instructions that include instructions for reloading only the respective selected frames, regardless of respective membership of the selected frames in framesets of the web page.

20. A computer readable medium for storing program instructions for reloading only selected frames in at least two framesets of a web page, the computer readable medium comprising:

instructions for instantiating a first frameset comprising a target frame to serve as a work area for performing programmed logic separate from the plurality of frames of the web page defined in a main frameset; and

instructions for specifying the selected frames not including at least one frame to avoid reloading from among the plurality of frames of the main frameset and reloading only the selected frames, the instructions for reloading being initiated by an activation of a trigger associated with the target frame.

21. A computer readable medium as claimed in claim 20 wherein the instructions for instantiating comprise a file written in hypertext markup language (HTML), that comprises a plurality of frameset definitions, including a definition of the first frameset comprising the target frame.

22. A computer readable medium as claimed in claim 21 wherein the file further comprises an event handling mechanism that associates the trigger with an action that comprises the instructions for reloading.
23. A computer readable medium as claimed in claim 22 wherein the action is an attribute of one of a link and a form, and the event is a corresponding one of a selection of the link, and a submission of the form.
24. A computer readable medium as claimed in claim 23 wherein the one of the link and the form has a target attribute set to the target frame.
25. A computer readable medium as claimed in claim 20 wherein the web page is a dynamic web page requiring adapting a content of the selected frames of the web page before reloading and re-rendering the selected frames.
26. A computer readable medium as claimed in claim 20 further comprising:  
instructions for executing the programmed logic associated with the action in the work area to collect required data and send a request to a web server with the required data for a script to control reloading; and  
instructions, responsive to receiving a response in the work area with a script and rendering data from the web server, for executing the script received from the web server to reload the selected frames as specified in the script with the rendering data.

**IX. Evidence Appendix**

There is no evidence submitted pursuant to §§ 1.130, 1.131, or 1.132 or any other evidence entered by the Examiner that is relied upon by Appellants in the appeal.

**X. Related Proceedings Appendix**

There are no decisions rendered by a court or the Board in any related appeals.